CHILDREN AS INFORMANTS ON HOUSEHOLD DIVISION OF LABOR

by

SUSAN ANNE CAMBRIA

B. A., Fairfield University, 1977

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1984

Approved by:

Carolyn S. Rosser

Major Professor

A11202 600718

LD
2668
.T4
1984
C355
c. 2

Table of Contents

List of Tables iii
Acknowledgements iv
Introduction 1
Chapter I 2
Children as Informants on Family Interaction . . . 3
Methodological Studies Comparing Child with Adult Reports 8
Division of Labor as a Crucial Variable 16

Chapter II
Purpose of the Study 26
Hypotheses 27
Sample 28
Measures 30
Scoring of the Measures 32
Procedure 34
Chapter III
Descriptive Statistics 36
Multiple Analysis of Variance 38
Pearson Correlations 44

Chapter IV
Discussion 46

References 50
Appendix A through J 54

LIST OF TABLES

1. Percentage of Family Members Who Participate in Each Task During Three Day Period 37
2. Means and Standard Deviations of Social Desirability Ratio Scores 39
3. Manova on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position: Individual Last Three Days Compared With Last Three Days Family Consensus 40
4. Manova on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position: Responsibility Compared to Last Three Days Family Consensus 41
5. Manova on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position: Next Week Compared to Last Three Days Family Consensus 42
6. Manova on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position: Last Week Compared to Last Three Days Family Consensus 43
7. Associations of Age and Accuracy of Report on Household Division of Labor. 45

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my thanks to the forty families who participated in this study. I am grateful to my committee members, Albert J. Davis, Ph.D., Stephan R. Bollman, Ph.D., and Candyce S. Russell, Ph.D. for their guidance. My special thanks goes to Dr. Russell, my major professor, for her patience and support. I appreciate my friend, Cathy Kohut, for her assistance with the analysis of the data and for her encouragement. Finally, I am grateful to my parents for their love and support during my years in Kansas and for their encouragement to pursue my academic goals.

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is on the accuracy with which children and parents report household division of labor. A principle borrowed from symbolic-interaction theory states that all family members do not perceive the same situation in the same way. However many studies focusing on marital, parent-child or whole family interaction have relied upon the wife as the prime informant, prompting Saflios-Rothschild (1969) to call the literature "wives family sociology." The picture that results from the studies using only wives as subjects, may not be accurate when measured against actual situations and ones that may be different from those presented by other family members. This study will attempt to provide empirical evidence on the question of how family reports differ and how such variables as sex and age effect the accuracy of the reports.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Various rationale have been offered for using children as informants in family research. Ausubel et al. (1954) believed that parents give responses that are more socially desirable than do children. Children may be more free of the desire to give responses that are approved by society. The authors suggest that children's naivete in testing situations can also lead to more accurate responses. Herbst (1952) also supports the view that parents give responses that more closely conform to societal norms than their children. Larson (1974) suggests that children are better able to differentiate family behaviors than their parents because in some situations they are observers of their parents actions instead of participants. The observer position, which Larson believes to be more objective, gives children a vantage point. Schaefer (1965a) hypothesized that the child's perception of his/her parents may be strongly related to his/her own adjustment. Schaefer's hypothesis has led to the development of measurement techniques that examine children's perceptions of their parents behavior (1965b).

Children as Informants on Family Interaction

Hayward (1935), using normal and delinquent children of varying ages and socioeconomic levels as subjects, investigated the differences in children's reports of family harmony, parental attitudes toward children and discipline. Delinquent children reported significantly more disharmony and disorganization in their families than normal children. Children of lower socioeconomic class reported the highest levels of family disharmony and disorganization. Boys in the Hayward study reported the highest amount of disorganization at ages 10 and 13; girls at ages 10 and 11. The fact that boys and girls and children at different ages varied in their assessments brings up the question of what effects age and sex have on the conclusions. The children did not favor either parent in their reports. At the time this pioneering study was done, many researchers accepted the view that delinquent children were more likely to come from disorganized families. Because the delinquent children in this sample did not report more disorganization, Hayward concluded that children are adequate observers and reporters of family behaviors.

As mentioned above, Hayward found children's responses to vary by age and sex. In a later study, Kagan (1956) found an interaction effect between age and sex. In a study with 217 6 to 7-year-old children Kagan found that 7-year-olds more often perceived the same sex parent as dominant. Hess and Torney (1962) also investigated the relationship of

sex and age on children's perceptions of power and authority within the family, as well as the influence of religion on children's reports. A sample of 1861 children ages 7 through 15 were asked "Who is the boss in your family?" They were given the choices of father more, mother more, both equal and I don't know. Boys reported their fathers significantly more often as the "boss" than did girls. Girls perceived the division of parental authority to be equal significantly more often than did boys. The 7 and 8-year-olds reported the highest numbers of father dominant structure. This trend levels off quickly, however, as by ages 9 and 10 male subjects report the lowest father dominance and highest equality levels. For females, this change also occurs, but does so more gradually. Seven and 8-year-old females report the highest percentages of father dominance, although it is still not as high as it is for boys. The percentages for females decrease over the years so that by ages 13 and up, the lowest percentages of the entire sample for father dominance and the highest for equality are reported. The results concerning religious affiliation show that Catholic children tend to perceive one parent as having more authority than the other and as sharing authority less than the Protestant sample. However, these religious differences were not statistically significant.

Two inventories, i.e., Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, (Roe & Siegelman, 1965); and Children's Report of

Parental Behavior Inventory, (Schaefer 1965b) were developed in the mid-1960s that identified similar parental behaviors as perceived by children. A brief discussion of these instruments is warranted since both instruments have been used in other research included in this literature review.

The Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR), developed by Roe and Siegelman (1965) consists of ten subtests which measure loving, protecting demanding, rejecting and neglecting behaviors on the parts of parents. The PCR was administered to 142 Harvard seniors, 22 engineers and 22 social workers. It is important to point out the exclusivity of the sample on which the PCR was tested and to keep that in mind when reviewing results based on the PCR. Another factor that was likely to have an effect on the results was that a retrospective method was used, that is, the subjects were asked to remember back to an earlier time in their lives and base their responses on that memory. Nevertheless, factor analysis on the data showed three clusters of parental behaviors: loving-rejecting, casual-demanding and overt concern for the child.

At approximately the same time Roe and Siegelman were developing their instrument, Schaefer (1965b) was working on another instrument, the Children's Report of Parent Behavior Inventory (CRPBI). Although the instrument was different from the PCR and was tested on a younger population, similar patterns of parental behavior were reported as were identified with the PCR. The CRPBI was given to eighty-five 12

through 14-year-old nonclinic children and eighty-one 12 through 18-year-old institutionalized male delinquents. Schaefer hypothesized that if significant differences were found between the delinquent and nondelinquent populations, this would constitute evidence for the CRPBI's validity, and indicate that children were adequate informants. The hypothesis was confirmed as 42 differences between the groups were found, 26 of which were significant at the .05 level and 14 significant at the .01 level. Schaefer found his items to cluster in three groups for both delinquent and nonclinic children. These factors were similar to those identified with the PCR. These two findings provide evidence that children can provide satisfactory reports of parental behavior.

Schluderman and Schluderman (1970) tested the CRPBI on subjects older in age than Schaefer's sample. A total of 317 male and 375 female University of Manitoba college students comprised the sample. The researchers shortened the inventory. A factor analysis of the data revealed the same three factors identified by Schaefer. This indicates that the CRPBI can be used in different populations.

Armentrout and Burger (1972) administered the inventory to 635 children in grades four through eight to test for differences in responses between grade levels. Schaefer's three factors were isolated in the analysis of responses at each grade level. Sixth and eighth grade girls reported greater parental acceptance than boys. A finding common to

many studies was that mothers were perceived as more accepting than fathers. Mothers were also perceived as using psychological control more often than fathers. In addition, significant differences were found between all grade levels for all three factors, indicating differences between age groups as well as between the sexes. Unfortunately in all these studies, there were no objective reports of parental behavior. If there had been objective reports, the responses of the children could have been compared to the objective reports. Furthermore, individual differences in children's accuracy could have been ascertained.

In another study by Burger (1975), the CRPBI was used to measure recalled parental behavior by 229 college students. The students also completed the California Psychological Inventory, which measures masculinity/femininity and degree of socialization with others. For males, those who scored high on masculinity and on socialization reported parents who encouraged autonomy and were not psychologically controlling. Those who fell into the low masculinity-low socialization group reported mothers as more psychologically controlling and less accepting than mothers in the former group. Fathers of the low masculinity-low socialization group were perceived as demonstrating lax control. For girls, those with high femininity-high socialization scores reported parents who encouraged independence. Those in the low femininity-low socialization group reported their mothers to be more controlling and rejecting. These results

substantiated theory at that time about what parental behaviors produce femininity and masculinity in children. Burger concluded that since these results were consistent with theory, the research supports the hypothesis that children can give accurate reports of their parents.

The studies described in the foregoing section all have a major difficulty in that they do not compare the children's responses against any other criterion, such as parental responses or examiners' observations. The importance of these studies is that they do provide support for the use of children as informants and they point out that age and sex of the respondents can effect the outcome. The next section is concerned with those studies that provide comparative assessments of the perceptions/reports of individual family members.

Methodological Studies Comparing Child With Adult Reports

In a study measuring family power, Turk and Bell (1972) compared the responses of family members on nine instruments that had been previously used by other researchers. Interviews were conducted in two stages--the first phase involved the wife alone, while the second phase included the whole family unit as subjects. There were 211 families tested. An eight item instrument measuring decision making that had been developed by Blood and Wolfe was administered to wives and then, other family members. The highest percentage of identical answers (24.6%) was between husband and child

responses, followed closely by husband and wife responses (21.2%). The second measure administered was Herr's measure of power, which calls for couples to indicate who usually wins in disagreements between them. Turk and Bell also had children respond to this question. Husband and wife pairs had the highest level of identical responses (54%), followed by wife-child pairs (50.5%) and then husband-child pairs (49.5%). The third measure consisted of asking family members "Who is the real boss in your family?." Again, husbands and wives had the highest percentage of identical agreements (68.4%), with wife-child pairs next (64.1%) and husband-child pairs last (47.4%). It is interesting to note the differences in intrafamily agreement when the same variable, that is family power, is measured via different instruments. Blood and Wolfe's measure showed husband-child pairs as highest in intrafamily agreement, while Herr's measure and the "boss" question show these same pairs to be lowest in intrafamily agreement. The remaining measures used in the Turk and Bell study were observational measures rather than self-reports. Among all the instruments tested, responses between family members were similar, but certainly not the same. A question that deserves consideration is which family members are the most adequate informants for which aspects of family life.

Larson (1975) conducted research on intrafamily perceptions of ideal marital roles. Two levels of perceptions were examined. One level consisted of the views each family

member held on ideal family roles. The second level consisted of each family member's perception of how the other family members would respond. Data were collected as a class project, with 29 college class members giving the questionnaire to their own family members over 9 years of age. A total of 29 fathers, 29 mothers, 16 sons and 17 daughters responded. In terms of ideal marital roles, husbands and daughters gave the most egalitarian responses. The responses of individual family members were significantly different on only one of the eight items. When the second analysis was completed, comparing responses to see who correctly perceived other family member's responses, daughters were found to be the most perceptive. They predicted parents' responses almost as well as husbands and wives predicted each other's responses. Daughters could also predict their brothers' responses, which parents were unable to do. Parents were significantly better than chance at predicting their daughters' responses, but not at their sons'. Older sons were clearly the least perceptive. Larson's research suggests that daughters may be better reporters of family beliefs of ideal roles than sons. Larson (1975) provides further evidence that the variables of age and sex of the respondent are important factors in determining accuracy.

Cox and Leaper (1961) also suggest that children are competent reporters of family interaction. The authors examined three aspects of the parent-child relationship.

The three variables were love, restriction (defined as parental behavior which inhibits children's freedom) and family cohesion (defined as family participation in and initiation of events). The original inventory was tested on 45 fifth-grade boys. After analysis of the data, the inventory was broken down into four factors: love, social restriction, household responsibilities and family cohesion. A revised edition was given to 150 10 and 11-year-old boys and then to 519 boys one-year later. To check validity and accumulate data on children as informants, mothers of 69 of the children were interviewed. They were questioned about child-rearing practices, love and household responsibilities. These interviews were held 18 months to 2-years after the boys completed the questionnaires. Scores from interviews with the mothers were significantly related to their children's responses on love and household responsibilities. Cox and Leaper concluded that the children did give accurate reports about their families.

Much of the evidence presented here indicates that family members do perceive family interaction differently, but the children can provide accurate information on family interaction. A factor that may influence accurate reports of family interaction are individual differences among family members in their tendency to respond in socially desirable ways. Niemi (1974) has found a tendency for parents to give more socially desirable responses than their children. Interviews were held with 1669 high school seniors and at

least one of their parents. One section of the interview concerned measures of family power, affection and agreement. Before intrafamily member responses were compared, responses of all students were grouped together and were compared to the responses of all the parents grouped together. Among the differences that did appear in the grouped data are the following: 1) students reported family structure as more distant, and interaction as having more friction than parents reported; 2) students indicated that there were more disagreements in their homes than parents did; and 3) for all but one question, parents gave responses that conformed more to societal norms than did children. These results suggest that children are less likely to give socially desirable responses. When intrafamily responses were compared, daughters and mothers showed the highest levels of agreement, while sons and mothers showed the lowest levels of agreement. Although the obtained correlations were generally low, these findings, as those of Larson, indicate that daughters may be more accurate informants than sons. Another important result from Niemi's research is that the parent-child correlations were higher for those items that concerned situations in which only parents were involved. This may lend support to Larson's (1974) hypothesis that children may be better informants because they have a more objective vantage point on some situations than do parents. They may be in a sense observers in their own homes of family interaction in which they do not have as active a role.

A study of children's perceptions of affectional behavior from parents (Cox, 1970) also provides support for using children as key informants. One-hundred children in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades were rated by their peers by asking each child which four classmates he/she most liked and which four classmates he/she least liked. Of the 52 families with high peer status children, 45 agreed to participate. Of the 48 families with low peer status children, 30 volunteered to participate. The Roe and Siegelman PCR questionnaire was administered to the children for 98 mothers and 75 fathers. The PCR was then modified and given to the parents for individual self-reports. In addition, teachers were asked to rate each child's adjustment and personality. Teacher ratings were classified as independent observations of the children's behavior. These ratings were used as measures of parent's behavior through the proposition that certain parental behaviors produced specific behaviors in their children that teachers could see in the classroom, such as relationships with others, including peers and teachers. If teacher ratings of children were more highly correlated with the children's report of parental behavior, then with the parents' self-reports, then children's reports would be considered more accurate than parents' self-reports. The results show that the teacher ratings were more significantly related to the child's perceptions of each parent's affectional behavior than to the parents' report of their own affectional behavior. Of the

parental reports, the mothers' were more highly correlated with the teacher/independent observations than the fathers' reports. This is one of the few studies that test intra-family perceptions against an outside observation. However, it must be noted that the teacher ratings and family perceptions were related through theory, i.e., that certain parental affectional behavior produced specific behaviors in children that teachers had rated, so these results must be viewed as tentative. If one accepts these findings, there are two interpretations. One is that children are in fact better reporters than parents. The other lends support to Schaefer's hypothesis that the children's perceptions may be more related to his/her own adjustment (measured in this study by the teacher reports) than the actual parental behavior.

Using a creative methodology, Ferreira (1964) tested intrafamily perceptivity. Subjects were asked to color a number of cardboard flags. The subjects were then given the flags colored by other family members. They were asked to throw away flags they did not like. The subjects were aware of which family member's flags he/she was examining. The number of flags thrown away was computed as a measure of rejection. Then each participant was asked to guess how many of his/her flags were being thrown away by each other family member. This then was defined as measuring the expectancy of rejection. Twenty-five normal family triads and 30 family triads with at least one member identified as

a "patient" and undergoing treatment served as subjects. Children in the study ranged in age from 10 to 25-years-old. Thirty children were boys and 25 were girls. There were a total of 148 good guesses which were defined as those guesses which were within one flag of the number of flags that were actually thrown away. This finding significantly exceeded the number of good guesses that would be expected by chance. Children made 53.6% of the good guesses. Adults made 40.5% of the good guesses. The difference between the children and parent groups on the number of good guesses was statistically significant. The children did not favor either parent. Fathers and mothers made approximately the same number of good guesses. Normal subjects had 48.3% of the good guesses while abnormal subjects had 41.7%, a difference which was not statistically significant. A methodological problem that Ferreira noted was that the number of flags thrown away was not necessarily indicative of an equal amount of rejection by each individual. To one person, throwing away six of the eight flags may be total rejection, while to another it may be partial rejection. An important result of this study was that when the number of good guesses was broken down by age, the youngest children made the largest number of good guesses. The number of good guesses declined steadily so that oldest parents made the lowest number of good guesses. Of the children, oldest children made the lowest number of good guesses.

One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that oldest parents are the parents of oldest children and youngest parents are the parents of youngest children. Perhaps the low guess rate of the oldest parents and children is a result of parent-child interaction, i.e., the oldest children are in their late adolescence, a period in which parents and children may be more distant from each other than younger parents and children.

Literature on children as informants of family interaction is limited in quantity. The studies discussed here lend credence to the hypothesis that children can be used as adequate reporters of family structure and interaction. Questions remain unanswered as to how the age and sex of the respondent effect the response. Another dimension that deserves attention is whether children are better informants on certain subjects than on others, as demonstrated by Larson (1975) and Niemi (1974). For instance, children may be better reporters on those issues in which they are not involved.

In this study, division of labor in the family will be the variable measured in order to determine the accuracy of each family member's report. The following section will describe the importance of division of labor in family functioning.

Division of Labor as a Crucial Variable

One of the assumptions that underlies the use of any family member as informant is that the subject must have

some knowledge of the material about which he/she is being queried. Division of labor in the household is material open to the observation of all family members. Furthermore, task allotment is a form of role taking which has been linked in the literature to such variables as marital satisfaction and single versus dual worker family lifestyles. A discussion of role theory and some of the research linking division of labor with marital satisfaction and dual career lifestyles will help to establish that division of labor is an important variable to study.

Mangus (1956) defines a role as the part performed by a participant in a social activity. He stated that roles are learned through the perception of expectations from significant others in an individual's life. According to Mangus, a role is performed effectively if the individual is aware of his/her part and the reciprocal roles performed by others. Certain roles are imposed, such as age and sex, while others are chosen such as occupation. An individual occupies many roles at one time. The organization of these roles was named by Mangus the "social self." He also contends that adaptive behavior in a marriage or family requires some degree of agreement of role expectations. Mangus maintains that a role discrepancy or conflict will emerge if the individual perceives he/she is expected to perform a role that is not pleasing or for which the individual does not have the resources. Role conflicts may be at the root of some interpersonal problems in a marriage. Mangus hypothesized

that the degree of marital satisfaction depends on the difference between what a spouse expects in a mate and what he/she perceives in the mate chosen. Also the degree of marital satisfaction depends on the differences between an individual's role expectations for his/her spouse and the spouse's expectations for himself/herself.

Cottrell (1942) discusses the idea that how adequately an individual performs a role is directly related to the clarity with which the role is defined. Role clarity is determined by the amount of inconsistency the individual perceives from significant others when he/she performs a role. Another proposition offered by Cottrell is that the amount of adjustment to a role is determined by that role's compatibility with the other roles already integrated into the individual's life. If roles are not compatible, role strain develops (Goode, 1960). Role strain is normal to a certain degree and is partially determined by role partners in the individual's social network as individuals work constantly at reducing role strain.

As with other complex social organizations, role behavior in families over time tends to become differentiated. The classic lines of differentiation are along the instrumental expressive axes. Parsons and Bales (1955) define instrumental roles as those that deal with external things and most often are allocated to males. Females, according to Parsons and Bales, occupy the expressive role which deals more with internal aspects. Kotlar (1962) found that

subject's views of the ideal husband showed significantly more instrumental activities than the view of the ideal wife. Husbands perceived themselves as being significantly more instrumental than they perceived their wives, while wives perceived themselves as significantly more expressive than their husbands.

Nye (1976) has identified seven major roles in marital dyads today. They are the provider role, the housekeeper role, the sexual role, the therapeutic role, the recreational role, the kinship role and the child care socialization role. The therapeutic role is defined as giving support and assistance to the other spouse and is an emerging role for both partners. Another newly defined role is the recreation role, which is defined as the one who plans recreation activities and outings for the family. The kinship role, defined as the person who keeps in touch with relatives, seems to be declining as a major role. Nye reports a sample of subjects feeling most competent in roles in the following order: child care, socialization, provider, therapeutic, housekeeper, kinship and recreation roles. The sexual role was not included in the competence question. Twenty percent of the husbands stated that the housekeeper role should be shared, while 55% of the wives felt that the role should be shared. Both spouses indicated that the husbands of working wives are more involved with the housekeeper role. However, the housekeeper role is

still more often done by women. Very few spouses reported paying the bills as the wives' responsibility.

The paradigm of seven roles supplied by Nye has been used by other researchers. Chadwick (1976) found that the most disagreement between husbands and wives occurred over the housekeeper and recreation roles in a study of 775 families. It was also reported that the desire to marry the same spouse and role satisfaction were significantly related to the evaluation of the spouse's performance on the roles. Araji (1977) also used the Nye paradigm in a study of the congruence between role attitudes and role behavior. Role attitude was defined as the one who should do the activities associated with a role while role behavior was defined as the one who actually performs the activities. The housekeeper role was found to have the greatest level of role behavior-attitude congruence. The greatest discrepancy was found for the provider role in that respondents stated that the role should be shared, while in the majority of cases the husband provided the income. The second largest discrepancy was also in the provider category, where respondents stated that the role should be the husband's while in actuality both spouses shared the provider role. Araji indicates that circumstances such as the number of children and whether or not the wife is employed contribute to the varying levels of role attitude-behavior congruence.

A study of the relationship of role conflicts to marital satisfaction (Ort, 1950) provides evidence that the

fewer conflicts in roles, the happier the marriage. One hundred married students answered an 88 question inventory and gave a self-report on the happiness of his/her marriage. The greater the number of conflicts reported, the lower the happiness reported. Significant differences were found between the high happiness and low happiness groups on the number of conflicts.

Another method of associating roles and marital satisfaction is to investigate whether difference in the perception of roles is related to satisfaction in marriage (Stuckert, 1963). Fifty newly married couples were interviewed on perceptions of roles for self and mate. The couples were also asked to evaluate their own marital satisfaction. The results show that the wife's marital satisfaction is significantly related to the accuracy with which she perceives her husband's role expectations. In this study, the husband's marital satisfaction is not related to his perceptions of his wife's expectations. However, the similarity between his expectations and his wife's expectations does have a significant relationship to his marital satisfaction. Stuckert points out that if the husband and wife differ widely on their expectations for each other and they realize it, the difference may detract from marital satisfaction.

Hawkins and Johnson (1969) provide additional support for the proposition that agreement between role expectations

and role performance is positively related to marital satisfaction. Couples were given 48 situations with multiple choice responses available. They had to choose one preferred response as to how the situation should be handled. The same 48 situations were then reworded to find out the actual behavior in the marriage. Perceived role discrepancy was defined as the degree to which marital role performance differs from role expectations. Imputed role consensus was defined as the degree to which role expectations differ from the subject's perception of his/her spouse's role expectations. Marital satisfaction was determined by a four item inventory asking such questions as "How well do you and your spouse get along at this time?" Reliability coefficients on all three aspects range from .87 to .94. The correlation between perceived role discrepancy and marital satisfaction was - .84 ($p < .001$) while the correlation between imputed role consensus and marital satisfaction was .72 ($p < .001$). The authors conclude that strong support is given for the idea that conformity to role expectations is related to marital satisfaction.

A further example of the importance of roles to marriage is provided by Burr (1971). Again, role expectations and role behavior were investigated by a questionnaire method. Over one hundred couples participated in the study. The role discrepancy score was calculated as the number of areas where a behavior of one spouse was perceived to bother the other spouse. Marital satisfaction was measured by

seven items from a scale originally developed by Bowerman. High negative correlations were found between role discrepancies and marital satisfaction. The findings also show that those roles rated low in importance had lower correlations with marital satisfaction than the roles rated high in importance.

The Yale Marital Inventory Battery, which presents couples with a series of role conflicts, has distinguished between clinic and nonclinic groups (Buerkle & Badgley, 1959; Buerkle et al. 1966). The Buerkle and Badgley studies found that those couples with a high degree of reciprocal role taking were more often found in the nonclinic group.

The literature reviewed in this section suggests that role expectations and role behaviors do indeed have a significant relationship with satisfaction in marriage.

In addition to the relationship between roles and marital satisfaction, there has been a focus in the literature on the effect that both spouses working has on roles in the family. A pioneering study by Blood and Wolfe (1960) shows that husbands did more of the traditionally masculine tasks such as lawn mowing, snow shoveling and household repairing while wives did more of the traditionally feminine tasks such as washing dishes, cooking and cleaning. A significant relationship was found between bill paying and decision making in that one partner usually performed both tasks. Higher income husbands did less housework than lower income husbands. Working wives received more help from their

husbands than nonworking wives and also helped less outside the home in traditionally male tasks.

Lopata interviewed wives and found similar results. Children were not seen as taking on much of the household responsibilities. The women reported they received the most help from their husbands in the area of grocery shopping. Forty-seven percent of the women stated they received no help from their spouses. Both of these studies had methodological problems, such as interviewing only one spouse and sampling procedures. Hence these results must be viewed with caution. However, other researchers have found that wives take on the majority of household tasks and/or work and/or take care of small children (Meissner et al., 1915; Angrist et al., 1976).

In their work on dual career families, Rapaport and Rapaport (1972, 1978) report role strain and role overload as a common problem. A dual career family is one where both spouses pursue independent careers to which they have a high degree of commitment and preserve a family life together. The Rapaports, like earlier researchers, report a disproportionate share of family roles falling to the wife in their sample of dual career families, despite egalitarian values. This gap between values and behavior may be the result of the relatively recent surfacing in society of the dual career lifestyle. Brown (1978) reports a 14-year gap between the time society views a role as changing toward egalitarianism and when it is actually seen in practice.

The conclusion from the literature is that roles are important to family life. As society changes, roles will change as will the family. Roles have been linked to other important variables, such as marital satisfaction and family harmony. Since roles are at the very basis of family life, they are important variables to study.

CHAPTER II

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate whether there are significant differences between children's and parent's reports as compared to a total family consensus on household division of labor. Using children as informants of family behavior has been posited to have certain advantages, in that children may be less prone to respond in a socially desirable manner (Ausubel et al., 1954; Herbst, 1952; Niemi, 1974), and therefore, may present a more accurate portrayal of their families than their parents. Larson has suggested that children may be better able to discriminate family process than their parents because they may not be directly involved in a situation and so may respond more like observers than participants. They may be more objective than their parents.

Studies involving children and parents as subjects have found that younger individuals seem to be more accurate informants (Ferreira, 1964; Larson, 1975) and that girls are better reporters of family behaviors than are boys (Larson, 1975; Niemi, 1974). Results from the Ferreira study show that children are significantly better indicators of intrafamily rejection than are parents. There are methodological problems with these studies, however, in that Larson and

Niemi did not include a measure of the actual family situation. Instead, the differing perceptions of family members were measured against each other.

In the present study division of labor was chosen as the content about which to measure family member's perceptions because it has been shown to be an important variable in determining marital and family satisfaction (Chadwick, 1976; Burr, 1971) and is one of which both parents and children have knowledge. The criterion for accuracy of individual family member reports will be the family's joint consensus on tasks completed during the preceding three days. This joint consensus will be elicited by the researcher through a family discussion following administration of pencil and paper measures to individual family members.

Hypotheses

I. Children will be more accurate reporters than parents on division of household labor.

II. As age of family members increase, accuracy of reporting on division of household labor will decrease.

III. Females will be more accurate reporters of division of household labor than will males.

Division of household labor will first be reported independently by each family member using a pencil and paper measure. These responses will later be compared with the joint family consensus solicited from the family group by the investigator.

Sample

The subjects in this study were 40 intact families with both parents, one child in the adolescent range, aged 13 to 19 and one child in the preadolescent range, aged 8 to 12, living in the same home. The age range was chosen in the hopes that children in these years would be associated with community groups, such as 4-H and youth groups through which contact with subjects could be gained. Also, children in this age range may be more available than older children but still old enough to have knowledge of division of labor patterns in the home. One of the drawbacks in contacting families through organized groups is that these children may have more of a "joiner" personality instead of those who are less connected with social and community groups.

Names of families who met the subject criterion were first ascertained from 4-H groups, church and youth organizations in Manhattan, Kansas and surrounding rural areas. Once the initial families were contacted, they gave additional names of families that they knew who met the criterion for inclusion in the sample. A letter and a copy of the informed consent (see Appendix for copies) were sent to over 225 families informing them of the nature of the study. These letters were followed in four days by a phone call to the family. A master list of family names and identification numbers has been kept separate from the data. If the family agreed to participate in the study, an appointment was scheduled. All families were given the choice of

meeting at the University or the interviewer coming to the home. All 40 families chose to meet at their homes.

The group of subjects had the following characteristics. Husbands ranged in age from 35 to 52 years of age, with a mean of 42.9. Wives ranged in age from 31 to 49 years of age, with a mean of 40.3. Older children (child 1) ranged in age from 14 to 18 with a mean of 15.2. Younger children (child 2) ranged in age from 7 to 13, with a mean of 11.2. Of the older children, 22 were males and 18 were females. The younger children were equally split with 20 males and 20 females. Education of husbands ranged from high school graduates to men with doctoral degrees, with a mean of 15.6 years of school. Education of wives ranged from ninth grade to women with a master's degree with a mean of 13.6 years of education. Older children ranged from completing seventh grade to twelfth grade with a mean of having completed 9.2 grades. Younger children ranged from completing first grade to eighth grade with a mean of having completed 5.3 grades. Thirty-six percent of the subjects gave their religion as Protestant, 26% listed their religion as Catholic, 10% stated they had no religion, 5% gave their religion as "Christian" and 2.5% listed their religion as Jewish. Couples ranged from being married from 14 to 31 years with a mean of 20.3 years. Of the fathers in the sample, 7.5% were in agriculture by occupation, 60% were in business or were self-employed, 22.5% were teachers, 5% were clergy, 2.5% were doctors and 2.5% were homemakers. Of the

mothers in the sample, 72.5% were homemakers, 15% were in business or were self-employed, 5% were teachers, and 5% were in a health related profession. Total family sized ranged from two children to seven, with a mean of 3.8.

Measures

The questionnaire used to measure household division of labor was originally devised by Stafford, Backman and DiBona (1977) in their study on division of labor among cohabiting and married couples. There are six sections to the questionnaire (see Appendix for copy). Each section gives the same list of nineteen tasks around the home. The first section calls for the respondents to mark a check in the box designating whose responsibility it is to perform each task. The second section calls for respondents to mark a check in the box designating who did each chore last week. The third section calls for respondents to mark a check in the box designating who will do each chore next week. In the next three sections of the questionnaire the respondents are asked to think back over the past three days and to mark a check in the box designating who performed each task on each of the previous three days. There are columns for Mother, Father, Child 1 (the adolescent subject) and Child 2 (the preadolescent subject), Equal and "not applicable." Equal is to be checked for a task if all family members participate in the task. A column for "we hassle about it" is included only in the section in "whose responsibility."

Directions for completing the questionnaire are printed on the form. In addition, subjects were read the following statement:

> For each of the 19 tasks listed on the questionnaire, please place a check in the box designating whose responsibility each chore is and who actually performed it last week. On page 2, the same tasks are listed, for who will perform them next week. On page 3, the same tasks are listed for who performed each task on each of the previous three days. If more than one person performs the task, you may place more than one check per row. If you do not know who performs the task, place a check in the 'don't know' column. If the task was not completed, please leave that row blank. If the task was done by someone in the family not participating in the study, place a check in the row outside the last column of the chart. If all family members participated in completing the task, place a check in the 'equal' column. Please do not ask the other family members if you are not sure.

To determine the subject's tendency to give socially desirable responses, parents were given the Edmonds Marital Conventionalization scale (Edmonds, 1976) while children were given the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1964) (see Appendix for copies). Both of these scales ask the respondent whether the item is true or false as it pertains to them. For both measures, the conventional response has been designated by the original authors.

After the family members completed the social desirability inventories, they were asked to reach consensus as a group about who completed the 19 tasks in the household division of labor inventory for each of the preceding three days, which were the same three days they had each answered

individually. At this time the family members could discuss with each other who did what task. Then, as a group, they gave an agreed upon response to the researcher. For this section, the researcher marked the checks in the appropriate boxes on a form labeled "total family consensus." This measure is the one against which the individual questionnaires were compared.

Scoring

Each individual family member's response for each task was compared to the total family consensus. If the individual agreed with the consensus, one "agree" was scored. If the individual disagreed, one "disagree" was scored. For example if for the task "wash dishes," Father marked that Mother and Child 1 did the task on Day 1 and on the total family consensus Day 1 the family agreed that Mother and Child 1 washed the dishes, 2 agrees were counted for Father's individual report compared with the Family consensus report for Day 1. However, if the total family consensus was that just Child 1 had washed the dishes on Day 1, then 1 agree (for Child 1) and 1 disagree (for Mother) were counted. The number of agrees were totaled and the number of disagrees were totaled. Then the number of disagrees were subtracted from the number of agrees. Each subject has 12 scores as follows:

1) individual report of Responsibility compared to consensus for Day 1

2) individual report of Responsibility compared to consensus for Day 2

3) individual report of Responsibility compared to consensus for Day 3

4) individual report of Last Week compared to consensus for Day 1

5) individual report of Last Week compared to consensus for Day 2

6) individual report of Last Week compared to consensus for Day 3

7) individual report of Next Week compared to consensus for Day 1

8) individual report of Next Week compared to consensus for Day 2

9) individual report of Next Week compared to consensus for Day 3

10) individual report of Day 1 compared to consensus for Day 1

11) individual report of Day 2 compared to consensus for Day 2

12) individual report of Day 3 compared to consensus for Day 3

Since each family had a different number of tasks completed on any one day, a ratio score was used in the data analysis. The ratio score is the number of agrees minus the number of disagrees divided by the total number of tasks as determined by the total family consensus. For example, if in Family 001, Father's score on "responsibility as compared to Day 1" was 4 and the number of tasks completed on Day 1 as determined by the total family consensus was 10, Father's ratio score would be 4/10 = .40. If in family 002, Father's number of tasks completed on Day 1 as determined by the total family consensus was 8, Father's ratio score would be 4/8 = .50.

Scoring on the social desirability inventories consisted of adding the total number of conventional responses. Ratio scores were used in the data analysis for the social desirability inventories. The actual score is the total number of items answered in a conventional manner as determined by the authors. The ratio score is the actual score divided by the total number of items the subject answered. For example, if Father made 10 conventional responses and answers a total of 20 items, his ratio score was 10/20 = .50.

After arriving at the family home, the interviewer read the informed consent to the family as follows:

> This survey is being conducted under guidelines established by Kansas State University. By cooperating, you will help to provide answers to important questions; however your participation is strictly voluntary. You should omit any questions which you feel unduly invade your privacy or which are otherwise offensive to you. Confidentiality is guaranteed. Your name will not be associated with your answers in any public or private report of the results.

Each subject was first given a background information sheet to complete (see Appendix for copy) with questions such as age, sex, occupation. Then the subjects were given a copy of the household division of labor inventory for responsibility, last week and next week. The instructions were read to the family as described on page 31. The interviewer answered any questions with each individual. After the family members completed the first three sections of the division of labor inventory they were given the next page

with the charts for the past three days. After the subjects completed those, they were given the social desirability inventories, labeled "Personal Reaction Inventory" and were told to respond true or false to each item as it pertained to them. The last section of the meeting consisted of the family coming to an agreement on who completed each of the 19 tasks over the previous 3 days.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Frequency distributions of which family member completed which task were completed on all 19 tasks. For these statistics, the total family consensus was used to get a measure of the actual work load of each respondent. Table 1 shows the percentage over the entire three-day period as reflected by the total family consensus on individual family member's participation in each task. Since more than one family member could participate in any task each day, values do not always add up to 100%. Wives clearly did more of the tasks "cooking, laundry, dishwashing and menu planning" than any other family members. Tasks least done by all families over the three-day period were "scrub floors, wash car and wash pets." Children were most involved in the tasks "feed pets, trash and pick up." Husbands and wives seemed to share equally in the tasks "weed garden, wash car, handle finances and discipline children." The single task all families consistently had most members involved in was "pick up." "Feed pets" was almost evenly divided among Wife, Child 1 and Child 2. Over all, wives appear to have a disproportionately large share of the work load. Twenty-five percent of the wives in this sample were employed outside the home.

Table 1

Percentages of Family Members Who Participated

In Each Task During Three Day Period

Task	Husband	Wife	Child 1	Child 2
Cooking	20	93	2	14
Dusting	1	22	14	13
Dishwashing	18	79	31	33
Vacuum	2	28	13	8
Laundry	4	71	11	6
Scrub Floors	1	8	1	2
Cut Lawn	3	2	11	8
Feed Pets	21	48	47	56
Weed Garden	18	21	8	16
Wash Car	6	4	7	7
Wash Pets	0	2	2	2
Handle Finances	69	62	2	0
Home Repairs	19	6	3	1
Trash	10	34	28	21
Clean Garage	4	1	3	1
Wash Windows	2	6	2	1
Discipline Children	81	86	1	0
Pick Up	72	100	86	88
Menu Planning	16	89	8	4

The largest differences between the wives' participation and the rest of the family were in the areas of cooking (W = 93%, H = 20%; C1 = 2%, C2 = 14%) and menu planning (W = 89%, H = 16%; C1 = 8%, C2 = 4%). Childrens' participation in "pick up, feed pets and diswashing" was the greatest of all the tasks. Tasks completed on a daily basis were "cooking, dishwashing, feed pets, discipline children, pick up and menu planning."

Mean scores for social desirability reveal that Child 1 had the highest level of social desirability ($\bar{x}$ = .39, SD = .18). Child 2 scores were slightly lower ($\bar{x}$ = .35, SD = .15). Husband and wife scores had the same average level of social desirability (Husband $\bar{x}$ = .25, SD = .18; Wife $\bar{x}$ = .25, SD = .19). The means and standard deviations were completed with the ratio scores rather than the raw scores, i.e., the number of socially desirable responses divided by the total number of responses that each individual gave. These mean scores reveal that in this sample parents have a slightly lower level of social desirability than children. The means scores and standard deviations are shown in Table 2.

Multiple Analysis of Variance

To test main hypotheses I and III, i.e., that children will be more accurate reporters than parents on division of labor and that females will be more accurate than males, three MANOVAS were run with two factors (sex and family position) and three dependent variables each. The three

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Social Desirability Ratio Scores

	$\bar{x}$	SD
Husband	.25	.18
Wife	.25	.19
Child 1	.39	.18
Child 2	.35	.15

Note. A higher score indicated a higher degree of social desirability than a lower score.

$\bar{x}$ = Mean

SD = Standard Deviation

clusters of dependent variables were individual reports of division of household labor on: a) Days 1 through 3; b) next week; and c) last week compared with the family consensus report of these same activities over the last three days. As can be seen in Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6, none of the multivariate F's (with the exception of the constant) was significant. Although the sex by position univariate F for Day 1 compared to consensus Day 1 was significant ($F = 4.45$; 1, 154 df, $p < .05$), that is likely to be a statistical artifact. As a general rule, statisticians do not recommend trying to interpret significant univariate F's that appear without corresponding significant multivariate F's (Hummel & Sligo, 1971). Thus both Hypothesis I and Hypothesis III are

Table 3

MANOVA on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position:

Last Three Days Compared with Last Three Days Consensus

N = 160

	Multivariate			Univariate					
				Day 1		Day 2		Day 3	
Source	F	(df)	(df)	MS/E	F	MS/E	F	MS/E	F
Constant	3.08*	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	823.27 / 170.33	4.83*	1687.14 / 289.98	5.82*	1161.23 / 152.73	7.60**
Sex	1.40	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	16.77 / 170.33	0.10	468.35 / 289.98	1.62	149.12 / 152.74	0.98
Position	0.44	(9, 462)	(3, 154)	92.27 / 170.33	0.54	245.57 / 289.98	0.85	146.96 / 152.74	0.96
Sex X Position	2.25	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	758.21 / 170.33	4.45	409.78 / 289.98	1.41	151.00 / 152.74	0.99

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Table 4

MANOVA on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position: Responsibility Compared with Last Three Days Consensus

N = 160

	Multivariate			Univariate					
				Day 1		Day 2		Day 3	
Source	F	(df)	(df)	MS/E	F	MS/E	F	MS/E	F
Constant	33.61	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	25.09 / .30	82.55	24.19 / .36	67.04	26.96 / .36	74.61
Sex	.63	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	.21 / .30	.71	.43 / .36	1.19	.63 / .36	1.76
Position	0.91	(9, 462)	(3, 154)	.30 / .30	.98	.62 / .36	1.72	.58 / .36	1.60
Sex X Position	.59	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	.25 / .30	.82	.64 / .36	1.77	.20 / .36	0.55

Table 5

MANOVA on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position:

Next Week as Compared To Three Day Family Consensus

N = 160

	Multivariate			Univariate					
				Day 1		Day 2		Day 3	
Source	F	(df)	(df)	MS/E	F	MS/E	F	MS/E	F
Constant	41.49	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	23.81 / .25	95.34	26.77 / .32	84.32	31.76 / .32	98.63
Sex	1.10	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	.50 / .25	2.01	.55 / .32	1.72	.01 / .32	.02
Position	.93	(9, 462)	(3, 154)	.26 / .25	1.06	.31 / .32	.98	.71 / .32	2.22
Sex X Position	.28	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	.21 / .25	.08	.21 / .32	.06	.06 / .32	.19

Table 6

MANOVA on Accuracy of Division of Labor Reports by Sex and Family Position:

Last Week as Compared To Three Day Family Consensus

N = 160

	Multivariate			Univariate					
				Day 1		Day 2		Day 3	
Source	F	(df)	(df)	MS/E	F	MS/E	F	MS/E	F
Constant	40.45	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	30.18 / .30	101.44	32.50 / .37	87.15	32.86 / .36	92.07
Sex	.08	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	.07 / .30	.27	.08 / .37	.21	.04 / .36	.11
Position	0.62	(9, 462)	(3, 154)	.26 / .30	.88	.48 / .37	1.29	.29 / .36	.82
Sex X Position	1.94	(3, 152)	(1, 154)	.29 / .30	.97	.30 / .37	.80	.07 / .36	.20

rejected, i.e., children were not more accurate reporters than parents; females were only slightly more accurate reporters of household division of labor than males.

Pearson Correlations

To test Hypothesis II, Pearson correlations were computed between age and each of the household division of labor scores. Of a total of 12 correlations, the only significant correlation was for the variable "Day 3 as compared to Day 3." It showed that as age increases, respondents' scores decreased ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$). This finding provides minimal support for Hypothesis II which states that as age increases, scores will decrease. There were no other significant relationships found between age of subjects and household division of labor scores. Pearson correlations appear in Table 7.

Additionally, Pearson correlations were run between social desirability scores and division of labor scores. A significant relationship was found for "last week as compared to Day 1," in that as social desirability increased, respondents' scores decreased ($r = .13$, $p < .05$).

Table 7

Association of Age and Accuracy of Report on Household Division of Labor:

N = 160

Responsibility as compared to Day 1	.0528	NS
Responsibility as compared to Day 2	.0949	NS
Responsibility as compared to Day 3	.0418	NS
Last week as compared to Day 1	.0557	NS
Last week as compared to Day 2	.1224	NS
Last week as compared to Day 3	.0928	NS
Next week as compared to Day 1	.0820	NS
Next week as compared to Day 2	.1093	NS
Next week as compared to Day 3	.0863	NS
Day 1 as compared to Day 1	-.0872	NS
Day 2 as compared to Day 2	-.1140	NS
Day 3 as compared to Day 3	-.1273	$p < .05$

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

No support was found for either Hypothesis I, i.e., that children are more accurate reporters than parents of household division of labor, or Hypothesis III, i.e., that females are more accurate reporters than males of household division. For all practical purposes, Hypothesis II, i.e., that as age increases, accuracy of reports decreases can also be rejected as finding one significant Pearson correlation in a sequence of 12 could have occurred by chance. On all of the variables, men and women, regardless of age gave similar responses. The overwhelming bulk of data failed to support the stated hypotheses. All family members, regardless of age, sex or family position were equally likely to agree with the total family consensus report of who actually did what tasks over the last three days.

In addition, mean scores of social desirability for children were higher than for adults. This finding is surprising in that the literature reviewed for this study indicated that the researcher should expect to find lower levels of social desirability in children rather than adults (Ausubel, et al., 1954; Herbst, 1952; Niemi, 1974). Since the measure used for parents was different than that used for children, it is difficult to assess exactly to what

degree the differences in scores indicate differences in social desirability. A more precise methodology would have been to use the same instrument for both children and adults.

The lack of significant differences by sex or family position was possibly due to a number of factors. The Stafford, Backman and DiBona measure was initially used by its authors to test for differences in household division of labor patterns between cohabitating and married couples. It was not tested with children or as a joint family consensus tool. Also, many of the families had set days for certain members to do each chore. Therefore, in those families the test was not a measure of accurate reporting but of knowing the household schedule.

Much of the research discussed in the literature review measured children's reports for variables such as parental behaviors toward children, family power and family relationships. This study questioned family members about a more concrete variable, division of labor. It may be that children are in fact better informants on issues that are more abstract and perhaps secretive in families, such as family power. An interesting study would be one in which the examiner first determines if parents and children showed different levels of social desirability on different variables. If two such variables were isolated, then differences in parent's and children's reports could be measured against an independent observation of each variable. In

this way, a more exact look at the role of social desirability and how it interacts with accurate reporting could be revealed.

Another possible reason for the lack of support for the hypotheses in this study is that parents may be more concerned about household division of labor than are children. To assess this, the examiner could give family members a list of variables and ask the family members to rate the importance of each variable to them individually. The variable that has the least difference in importance for parents and children may be wiser to study than one which is far more important to one group or the other.

One of the limitations of this study is the question of how the total family consensus is effected by the power structure in the family. If Father has more power in the family than any other individual, the others might go along with him when he voiced his opinion in reaching an agreement for the total family consensus, which is the basis for the accuracy measure. Another difficulty in the methodology of this study is that some families rotated chores week by week and therefore when comparing the retrospective and predictive reports against the three-day consensus, the same family members were not always involved in the same chores. For this reason, the most accurate measure in this study is in comparing each of the individual's three-day reports against the total family consensus for the same three days.

This study does have strengths in that it tests individual family members' reports against a criterion measure, via family consensus on the same items asked of individuals. The results challenge the previous literature which suggests females and younger individuals are more accurate reporters. There is enough consistency in the literature to suggest further research needs to be done on this important topic for both clinicians and researchers. An interesting study would be one where individual family members' reports, a total family consensus, and an independent observer's viewpoint were compared to investigate which family members are the most accurate reporters. Clearly more research with clear and carefully planned methodology that investigates such variables as sex, age, family position and social desirability of the respondents must be completed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angrist, S. S., Love, J. R. & Mickelsen, R. (1976). How working mothers manage: socioeconomic differences in work, child care and household tasks. Social Science Quarterly, 156 (4), 631-638.

Araji, S. K. (1977). Husbands and wives attitude--behavior congruence on family roles. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 39 (2) 309-320.

Armentrout, T. & Burger, G. K. (1972). Children's reports of parental child rearing behavior at five grade levels. Developmental Psychology, 7 (1), 44-48.

Ausubel, D. P., Balthazar, E. E., Rosenthal, I., Blackman, L. S., Schpoont, S. H. & Welkowitz, J. (1954). Perceived parent attitudes as determinants of child's ego structure. Child Development, 25 (3), 173-183.

Becker, G. K. (1975). Recalled parental behavior, sex roles and socialization. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31 (2), 292-298.

Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). Husbands and wives. The Dynamics of Married Living. Glencoe Illinois: The Free Press.

Brown, B. W. (1978). Wife employment and the emergence of egalitarian marital role prescriptions: 1900-1974. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 9 (1), 5-17.

Buerkle, J. V., Anderson, T. R. & Badgley, R. F. (1961). Altruism, role conflict and marital adjustment: a factor analysis of marital interaction. Marriage and Family Living, 23 (1), 20-26.

Buerkle, J. V. & Badgley, R. F. (1959). Couple role taking: the Yale marital interaction battery. Marriage and Family Living, 21 (1), 53-58.

Burger, G. K. (1975). Recalled parental behavior, sex roles and socialization. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31 (2), 292-298.

Burr, W. R. (1971). An expansion and test of a role theory of marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (2), 368-372.

Chadwick, B. A. (1976). Marital and family role satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38 (3), 431-440.

Cottrell, L. S. (1942). The adjustment of the individual to his age and sex roles. American Sociological Review, 7 (5), 617-620.

Cox, F. N. & Leaper, P. M. (1961). Assessing some aspects of the parent-child relationship. Child Development, 33, 637-649.

Cox, S. H. (1970). Intrafamily comparison of loving-rejecting child rearing practices. Child Development, 41 (2), 437-448.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approved material. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Edmonds, V. H. (1967). Marital conventionalization: definition and measurement. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 681-688.

Ferreira, A. J. (1964). Interpersonal perceptivity among family members. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 34, 64-70.

Goldin, P. C. (1969). A review of children's reports of parent behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 222-236.

Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. American Sociological Review, 25 (4), 483-496.

Hawkins, J. L. & Johnsen, K. (1969). Perception of behavioral conformity, imputation of consensus and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31 (3), 507-511.

Hayward, R. S. (1935). The child's report of psychological factors in the family. Archives of Psychology, 28 (1), 1-75.

Herbst, P. G. (1952). The measurement of family relationships. Human Relations, 5, 3-36.

Hess, R. D. & Torney, J. V. (1962). Religion, age and sex in children's perceptions of family authority. Child Development, 33, 781-789.

Hummel, T. J. and Sligo, J. R. (1971). Empirical comparison of univariate and multivariate analysis of variance procedures. Psychological Bulletin, 66 (1), 49-57.

Kagan J. (1956). The child's perception of the parent. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53, 257-258.

Kottar, S. L. (1962). Instrumental and expressive marital roles. Sociology and Social Research, 46 (2), 186-194.

Larson, L. E. (1974). System and subsystem perception of family roles. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36 (1), 123-138.

Larson, L. E. (1975). Multilevel family interpersonal perception of ideal marital roles: an explanatory study. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 6 (2), 223-237.

Leik, R. L. (1963). Instrumentality and emotionality in family interaction. Sociometry, 26 (2), 131-145.

Lively, E. (1969). Toward conceptual clarification: case of marital interaction. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 31, 108-114.

Lopata, H. Z. (1971). Occupation: housewife. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mangus, A. R. (1956). Role theory and marriage counseling. Social Forces, 35 (2), 200-209.

Meissner, M., Humphreys, E. W., Meis, J. M. & Schu, W. J. (1975). No exit for wives: sexual division of labor and the cumulation of household demands. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12 (4), 424-439.

Niemi, R. G. (1974). How family members perceive each other: political and social attitudes in two generations. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nye, F. I. (1974). Emerging and declining family roles. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36 (2), 238-248.

Nye, F. I. & Slocum, W. J. (1976). Provider and housekeeper roles in F. Ivan Nye (ed.). Role Structure and Analysis of the Family. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Nye, F. I. (1976). Family roles in comparative perspective in F. Ivan Nye (ed.). Role Structure and Analysis of The Family. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Ort, R. S. (1950). A study of role conflicts as related to happiness in marriage. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 45 (4), 691-699.

Parsons, T. & Bales R. F. (1955). Family socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Rapoport, R. & Rapoport, R. N. (1971). Dual Career Families. Harmondworth England: Penguin.

Rapoport, R. & Rapoport, R. N. (1978). Dual career families: progress and prospects. Marriage and Family Review, 1 (5).

Roe, A. & Siegelman, M. (1963). A parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 34, 355-369.

Saflios-Rothschild, C. (1969). Family sociology or wives' family sociology? a cross-cultural examination of decision making. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 31, 290-301.

Scanzoni, J. A. (1965). Note on the sufficiency of wife responses in family research. Pacific Sociological Review, 8 (2), 109-115.

Schaefer, E. S. (1959). Children's reports of parental behavior: an inventory. Child Development, 36 (2), 413-424.

Schaefer, E. S. (1956). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26 (6) 552-557.

Schluderman, E. & Schluderman, S. (1970). Replicability of factors in children's report of parent behavior (CRPBI). Journal of Psychology, 76 (2), 239-249.

Stafford, R., Backman, E. & DiBona, P. (1977). The division of labor among cohabiting and married couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39 (1), 43-58.

Stuckert, R. P. (1963). Role perception and marital satisfaction. Marriage and Family Living, 25 (4), 415-419.

Turk, J. & Bell, N. (1972). Measuring power in families. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 24, 215-222.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

KSU Research Office

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5505

Dear_____,

I really need your help.

As a graduate student in the Department of Family and Child Development in the College of Home Economics at Kansas State University, I am currently completing work on my thesis. My study concerns the way families spend time together and participate in household tasks.

_____gave me your name as a family that may be interested in participating in my study. I specifically need families where both parents are in the home and where there is at least one child between 9 and 13 years of age and a second child between 14 and 19 years of age. So you can see that, for me, you are a very special family.

The procedures would take approximately one hour of your time. Confidentiality is guaranteed. A number will be substituted for your name so that your name will not be used in any public or private report of the results. I would be able to come to your home at your convenience or we could arrange a meeting place at Kansas State University. I will be calling you shortly to answer any questions you may have and to set up an appointment if that is something your family agrees to do.

Thank you for your time . . . I know families with teenagers often have hectic schedules.

Sincerely,

Sue Cambria
Graduate Student
under the supervision
of Candyce S. Russell, Ph.D.

APPENDIX B

Background Information

Circle one: Husband Wife Child 1 Child 2

Age on last birthday:_____

Sex:_____

Highest grade of school completed:_____

Years married:_____

Occupation:_____

Number of children in family:_____

Religion:_____

APPENDIX C

Please check the appropriate box to describe your responsibility and actual performance of chores in your household.

	WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY								WHO ACTUALLY PERFORMS						
	Husband	Wife	Both Parents	Child 1	Child 2	We hassle About it	Not Applicable	Don't know	Husband	Wife	Child 1	Child 2	Equal	Not Applicable	Don't know
Cooking															
Dusting															
Dishwashing															
Vacuum															
Laundry															
Scrub Floors															
Cut Lawn															
Feed Pets															
Pull Weeds															
Wash Car															
Wash Pets															
Handle Finances															
Home Repairs															
Take Out Trash															
Clean Garage															
Wash Windows															
Discipline Children															
Pick Up															
Menu Planning															

APPENDIX D

Please check the appropriate box to describe the actual performance of chores in your household.	Husband	Wife	Child 1	Child 2	Equal	Not Applicable	Don't know
Cooking							
Dusting							
Dishwashing							
Vacuum							
Laundry							
Scrub Floors							
Cut Lawn							
Feed Pets							
Pull Weeds							
Wash Car							
Wash Pets							
Handle Finances							
Home Repairs							
Take Out Trash							
Clean Garage							
Wash Windows							
Discipline Children							
Pick Up							
Menu Planning							
WHO ACTUALLY PERFORMS							

APPENDIX E

Please check the appropriate box to describe the actual performance of chores in your household	Husband	Wife	Child 1	Child 2	Equal	Not Applicable	Don't know	Husband	Wife	Child 1	Child 2	Equal	Not Applicable	Don't know
	WHO ACTUALLY PERFORMS							WHO ACTUALLY PERFORMS						
Cooking														
Dusting														
Dishwashing														
Vacuum														
Laundry														
Scrub Floors														
Cut Lawn														
Feed Pets														
Pull Weeds														
Wash Car														
Wash Pots														
Handle Finances														
Home Repairs														
Take Out Trash														
Clean Garage														
Wash Windows														
Discipline Children														
Pick Up														
Menu Planning														

H W

APPENDIX F

Edmunds Marital Conventionalization Scale

Personal Reaction Inventory

Listed below are a number of statements concerning you, your mate and your marriage. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you. Circle T or F.

T F 1. My marriage is an unhappy one.

T F 2. I can't conceive of anyone more happily married than I am.

T F 3. There are some things about my marriage that do not entirely please me.

T F 4. My mate has some habits that I do not like.

T F 5. I think I could be much happier if I had married someone else.

T F 6. My marriage is happier than the average, but less so than the very successful ones.

T F 7. I have some needs that are not being met by my marriage.

T F 8. I think my marriage is neither more nor less happy than most marriages.

T F 9. There is never a moment that I do not feel "head over heels" in love with my mate.

T F 10. My marriage could be happier than it is.

T F 11. Although I am usually happy with my mate, he (she) occasionally makes me feel miserable.

T F 12. I confide in my mate about everything.

T F 13. If every person in the world of the opposite sex had been available and willing to marry me I could not have made a better choice.

T F 14. If we should encounter serious difficulties in our marriage I have no doubt that we would emerge happier than before.

T F 15. We get angry with each other sometimes.

T F 16. I have never known a moment of sexual frustration since getting married.

G

T F 17. I don't think any couple could live together with greater harmony than my mate and I.

T F 18. I might have been happier had I married somebody else.

T F 19. There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my mate.

T F 20. I have never regretted my marriage, not even for a moment.

T F 21. We are as well adjusted as any two persons in this world can be.

T F 22. Although my mate and I get along very well together, I think I could be happier married to someone else.

T F 23. I don't think anyone could possibly be happier than my mate and I when we are with one another.

T F 24. We sometimes get on each other's nerves.

T F 25. My mate makes me angry sometimes.

T F 26. My marriage is a very happy one.

T F 27. No one but my mate holds any attraction for me.

T F 28. I have known very little happiness in my marriage.

T F 29. My marriage borders on being unhappy.

T F 30. My mate completely understands and sympathizes with my every mood.

T F 31. My marriage is not a perfect success.

T F 32. There are some things about my mate that I do not like.

T F 33. There are times when I wonder if I made the best of all possible choices.

T F 34. I'm quite happily married.

T F 35. Every new thing I have learned about my mate has pleased me.

T F 36. I don't think anyone could possibly be happier than my mate and I are with one another.

T F 37. Some of my dealings with my mate are prompted by selfish motives.

T F 38. If I had my life to live over I wouldn't even think of marrying another person.

H

T F 39. My mate has all of the qualities I've always wanted in a mate.

T F 40. If my mate has any faults I am not aware of them.

T F 41. I believe our marriage is reasonably happy.

T F 42. When disagreements arise they are always settled in a peaceful, fair, and democratic manner.

T F 43. My marriage could be much happier than it is.

T F 44. I have never thought of my marriage as having made me particularly happy or unhappy.

T F 45. My mate occasionally makes me feel miserable.

T F 46. My mate and I understand each other completely.

T F 47. Once in a while I am not completely truthful with my mate.

T F 48. There are times when my mate does things that make me unhappy.

T F 49. There are some things about my mate that I would change if I could.

T F 50. My marriage is a happy one.

H W

APPENDIX I

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

Personal Reaction Inventory

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you. Circle T or F.

T F 1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.

T F 2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.

T F 3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

T F 4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.

T F 5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.

T F 6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

T F 7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.

T F 8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.

T F 9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.

T F 10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

T F 11. I like to gossip at times.

T F 12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

T F 13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

T F 14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.

T F 15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

T F 16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

T F 17. I always try to practice what I preach.

J

T F 18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.

T F 19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.

T F 20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

T F 21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

T F 22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.

T F 23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.

T F 24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.

T F 25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.

T F 26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.

T F 27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.

T F 28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

T F 29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.

T F 30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

T F 31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.

T F 32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.

T F 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

CHILDREN AS INFORMANTS ON HOUSEHOLD DIVISION OF LABOR

by

SUSAN ANNE CAMBRIA

B. A., Fairfield University, 1977

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1984

ABSTRACT

Forty families having at least two children in the adolescent and preadolescent stages responded individually to the Stafford, Backman and DiBona (1977) inventory of household division of labor according to the following four instructions: who's responsibility each chore is, who performed the chore last week, who will perform the chore next week, and who performed each task on each of the three previous days. Following collection of the individual reports, the entire family was asked to respond to the same items as a group. This jointly agreed upon group response was used as the criterion against which accuracy of individual responses were judged.

Based on a review of the literature, it was hypothesized that children would be more accurate reporters than parents, that females would be more accurate reporters than males and that as age increases, accuracy of reporting would decrease. All hypotheses were rejected.

Interpretations of the findings are complicated by the possibility that the family consensus criterion reflects relative power within the family more than a description of who actually does what chore in the household.